REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Please update the correspondence address in the above-referenced application to reflect the Change of Correspondence Address filed January 14, 2005.

Corrected drawing sheets are enclosed herewith. The specification also has been amended accordingly. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings are overcome.

Pending claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,625,889 (Chikkaswamy) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,597,672 (Gustafsson). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As to amended claim 1, neither of the references teach or suggest sniffing for available cellular frequency channels via a mobile station. In this regard, Chikkaswamy only discloses that a RF detection circuit of an overlay system detects for available frequency channels. However, this detection circuit is part of an overlay system, and not of a mobile station. *E.g.*, Chikkaswamy, col. 1, ln. 64 – col. 2, ln. 35. Nor does Gustafsson teach or suggest sniffing for available frequency channels whatsoever. For at least this reason, claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the proposed combination.

Dependent claim 2 is further patentable as neither of the references teach or suggest communicating via the mobile station on a short-range radio channel. In this regard, the Office Action contends that Chikkaswamy teaches communicating over a voice channel and "it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that a voice channel may be interpreted as a short range radio channel." Office Action, p. 5. However, as disclosed by the specification, a short-range radio channel is different than a cellular channel (*e.g.*, Specification, 17-18), which is all that Chikkaswamy teaches or suggests. Neither of the cited references teach or suggest short-range radio channel usage. Instead both are directed to cellular systems. Accordingly for this further reason, claim 2 and the claims depending therefrom are further patentable.

For similar reasons, claim 5 is further patentable as neither of the references teach or suggest substituting at least one allocated cellular channel with a short-range radio channel if the cellular channel becomes unavailable. In this regard, the Office Action concedes that Chikkaswamy nowhere teaches or suggests such substitution. Further, as to Gustafsson all that is taught is moving an existing cellular channel from one location to another to differently allocate

channels between different cellular devices. Nowhere however does Gustafsson teach or suggest substituting channels of different types (i.e., short-range and cellular) as recited in claim 5 or its vice versa as recited by claim 6.

For similar reasons as to claims 2 and 5, dependent claim 9 is further patentable as nowhere does either of the references teach or suggest bonding a short-range radio channel and allocated cellular frequency channels. This is so, at least because neither of the references teach or suggest use of short-range radio channels.

Independent claim 16 is patentable, at least because neither of the references teach or suggest a mobile device that includes a reconfigurable processor core including both a long-range transceiver and a short-range transceiver and a radio frequency sniffer. Instead, both references are directed to base station circuitry. Furthermore, as discussed above there is nothing in Gustafsson, which is directed to a cellular system, that teaches or suggests a short-range transceiver. For at least these reasons, claim 16 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the proposed combination.

Dependent claim 20 is further patentable for the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 9. That is, nowhere does either of the references teach or suggest a circuit configured to bond a short-range radio channel with cellular frequency channels. For this further reason, claim 20 is patentable over the proposed combination.

Pending claim 3 stands rejected under §103(a) over Chikkaswamy in view of Gustafsson and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,871 (Cannon). Claim 3 is patentable over this proposed combination for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Chikkaswamy and Gustafsson.

New claims 21-27 are patentable, at least for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 2, 2005

Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B and 3, and a new FIG. 1C. These sheets include FIGS. 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B and 3, and a new FIG. 1C, and replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B and 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

APPENDIX